

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The office action of July 13, 2004 has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-3, 9-13, 18-27 and 30-35 remain pending in this application. Claims 4-8, 14-17, 28, 29, 36 and 37 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Preliminarily, applicants note with appreciation the indication that the application contains allowable subject matter. Specifically, claim 8-10, 19 and 29 stand objected to for being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if amended to incorporate all the features of their ultimate base claim. Applicants have rewritten claim 1 to incorporate the features of objected to claim 8, rewritten claim 20 to incorporate the features of objected to claim 29, and rewritten objected to claims 9, 10 and 19 in independent form to place all these claims in condition for allowance.

Applicants appreciate the consideration of the numerous Information Disclosure Statements (IDS) submitted during prosecution of the instant application. While most of the IDS' and PTO-1449 forms have been fully initialed by the Examiner noting consideration of the cited references, Applicants raise the following remaining issues:

1. Three of the references identified on page 1 of the PTO-1449 form from the November 27, 2002 IDS have been crossed-through. The undersigned is confused as to why these references have been crossed-through. A copy of page 1 showing the reference citations crossed-through by the Examiner is attached. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner either confirm that these crossed-through references have been made of record, or alternatively that the Examiner return an PTO-892 to make these references of record.

2. The undersigned did receive the initialed copy of the PTO-1449 form (4 pages) submitted with the IDS filed on June 23, 2003; however, on page 1, five of the cited references have been crossed-through. Again, the undersigned is confused as to why these references have been crossed-through. A copy of page 1 showing the reference citations crossed-through by the Examiner is attached. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner either confirms that these crossed-through references have been

made of record, or alternatively that the Examiner return an PTO-892 to make these references of record.

Claims 1-5, 11-16, 15, 18, and 30-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent no. 6,144,991 to *England* and claims 6, 7, 14, 16, 17, 20-28 and 37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *England* as applied to claim 1, and further in view of U.S. patent no. 5,822,720 to *Bookman et al.* ("*Bookman*"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Nonetheless, to expedite prosecution, applicants have rewritten independent claim 1 and 20 to incorporate the features of claims 8 and 29, respectively, which have been identified as containing allowable subject matter. Also, claims 9, 10 and 19 have been rewritten in independent form to include the allowable subject matter acknowledged in the action. Accordingly, independent claims 1, 9, 10, 19 and 20 are considered allowable for at least these reasons. Claims 2, 3, 30 and 31, which ultimately depend from claim 1, and claims 21-29, 34 and 35, which ultimately depend from claim 20, are considered distinguishable over the applied art for the same reasons as their ultimate base claim and further in view of the novel and non-obvious features recited therein.

Claim 11 has been amended to incorporate the features of dependent claim 37 and calls for features similar to independent claim 10, which has been identified by the action as containing allowable subject matter. The action in rejecting claim 37 relies on the combination of *England* and *Bookman*. Nonetheless, the combination of *England* and *Bookman*, even if proper, would not have provided a teaching or suggestion of displaying a *viewport* to the first document context as a pinned page overlayed on the second document context. For at least this reason, amended claim 11 is patentably distinguishable over the applied art. Also, claims 12, 13, 32 and 33, which ultimately depend from claim 11, are considered allowable over the applied art for the same reasons as claim 11 and further in view of the novel and non-obvious features recited therein.

Claim 18 has been rewritten in independent form and is similar to original claim 8, which has been identified as containing allowable subject matter and which has been incorporated into amended claim 1. The action however asserts that claim 18 is obvious over *England*. Yet,

Appln. No.: 09/556,865
Amendment dated August 30, 2004
Reply to Office Action of July 13, 2004

England lacks a teaching or suggestion of, in response to user selection of the link, automatically pinning the first document context and navigating to the second document context and shifting the navigational focus to the second document context as recited in claim 18. Accordingly, claim 18 is considered allowable.

CONCLUSION

A Fee Transmittal is attached. If any additional fees are required or if an overpayment is made, the Commissioner is authorized to debit or credit our Deposit Account No. 19-0733, accordingly.

All objections and rejections having been addressed, applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicit prompt notification of the same.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: August 30, 2004

By:



Gary D. Fedorochko
Registration No. 35,509

1001 G Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001-4597
Tel: (202) 824-3000
Fax: (202) 824-3001
GDF:lab